

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HIGHER EDUCATION

and

ENERGY COMMITTEE

of the

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Economic Development, Higher Education & Energy Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Wednesday May 10, 2006.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Wayne Horsley • Chairman

Legislator Rick Montano • Vice•Chair

Legislator Tom Barraga

Legislator Jon Cooper

Legislator Lynne Nowick

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan • Counsel to the Legislature

Joe Schroeder • Budget Review Office

Joe Muncey • Budget Review Office

Renee Ortiz • Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature

Ben Zwirn • County Executive's Office

Carolyn Fahey • Economic Development

Charles Stein • Suffolk Community College

George Gatta • Suffolk Community College

James Morgo • Commissioner • Economic Development

All other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano • Court Stenographer

(* THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:46 A.M. *)

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Obviously we are all standing, so let's Pledge of Allegiance.

SALUTATION

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And may we also stand for a moment of silence for those wonderful men and women who are protecting our freedoms across the sea, and may they be protected.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you. Please be seated. Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the Economic Development, Higher Education and Energy Committee Meeting of May 10th. And our agenda doesn't look too onerous particularly after yesterday going to five o'clock for committee meetings. Five o'clock, yes. It was all about the Southwest Sewer District and privatization. There you go. All right.

We have a special guest today that I would like to introduce. Mr. Moke McGowan who is with the •• President of the Long Island Convention and Sports Commission. Moke and I first met when he gave a presentation to the Babylon Rotary Club, and I have to tell you, he really give a new vigor to the commission and something that •• and an idea and concept that the commission really is in a positive vain and moving forward. I just wanted to

invite him here today so he can give a little background not only on himself, but where he comes from, because some of us may not be familiar with Moke and also where the Convention Bureau is going, because it is so critical to the economic development of Long Island and our economy. Moke, welcome.

MR. MCGOWAN:

Legislator Horsley and Members of the Economic Development Committee, thank you for the invitation today to be before you and to briefly talk a little bit about a Long Island Convention Bureau, where we currently are and where we hope to continue going. I have had the opportunity to meet individually with each of the members on this committee, and it has been my pleasure to listen to their thoughts, their concerns, their beliefs in the organization and the direction that we are heading in. And I'm delighted with that kind of feedback.

We have been very focused in the past year and a half, almost two years now, since I first came before this body. We're really focused on two primary things. One is maintaining an accountable organization, maintaining an organization and developing really a culture of accountability and transparency. At the same time, we have been very, very focused on business of driving visitation to Long Island as a region and certainly leveraging the many assets that Suffolk County has to that endeavor.

I think it has yielded some wonderful results, but we certainly don't want to take credit for what we have seen transpire in the past year and a half. We are seeing today better occupancy rates in our hotels than we have seen in a number of years, we are seeing better rates by those hotels than we have seen in a number of years. But we're also seeing an increased expansion of hotel rooms that makes that endeavor that much more difficult. We do have challenges in driving business to Long Island. But we also have seen, if you

will, a tremendous, better than 20%, increase in sales taxes generated by visitor expenditures here in Suffolk County. On Long Island overall, it has increased substantially. And that's on the basis of •• following on the basis of a decrease, if you will, or a very lowering of sales tax generation.

Again, we will not take credit for that. We have wonderful products, we have wonderful reasons why people are visiting and why travel is picking up nationwide. But we certainly are in the market place today where we have not been in the past, and we think we are making our presence known. It certainly helps to have national airing of the Apprentice showing out of the aquarium, Atlantis Aquarium in Riverhead about three weeks ago and Raphael's Vineyards on the North Fork this past week. So those things all cumulatively and collectively help us in your endeavors to market, promote and sell Long Island and Suffolk County.

I would be more than happy at any time to answer any questions that you may have. I do have two things that I would like to touch basis on briefly that are a little bit of the norm for the Convention and Visitors Bureau. We are •• we have been endeavoring to become under my leadership a•political. For the most part, I don't believe that it behooves us to get outside of the realm of our core competencies of marketing and sales. But occasionally, we do get involved in issues that have a dramatic or potentially dramatic on our industry as a whole or segments of our industry.

And for that reason, I would like to say that as an industry, we certainly support the endeavor to create a seamless wireless internet connectivity throughout Suffolk County to our endeavors to generate tourism. Please don't ask me to say that two times in a row, I fill falter all over it. But no question, as I said two years ago, the internet is singularly the strongest marketing tool to come along since the printed word. And in our industry, it is probably more so, both from a transactional standpoint or buying tourism

products and making decisions as to where you are going to visit and how you are going to spend your time and money to providing direct quick instant information to people while they are traveling. So we certainly support the initiative to create a seamless wireless connectivity throughout Suffolk County.

I will also say, we are contractually obligated to operate two Welcome Centers for Suffolk County, one is at the airport and the other along the LIE, which we're hoping to upgrade, downgrade, if you will, on an interim basis until DOT creates or builds the new, utilizing a modular trailer welcome center. We don't have the ability to go online on the internet from that location. We could do it through the phone, but we would be doing it at 50 K •• 56 K transfer rate, which is, as you know, deathly slow.

The idea of having the wireless connectivity would give us the opportunity to provide instant information directly to our visitors who don't have wither Smart Phones, access through their cell phones, or Smart Phone or PDA. So that's just a small example of how well something like this would work overall. The internet, as I said, we have internet penetration in the US households to 74%. And it is growing from a wireless standpoint. Broadband is going to be and actually is the norm today. We see higher broadband usages in places like Japan and China. It is something that is growing here in the US and Canada, albeit at a slower pace. But if we can get ahead of the curve here on Long Island, there's no question that it will substantially elevate our position within a very competitive environment.

The other thing that I wanted to touch bases with you on today is something that affects predominantly our small businesses in tourism. Roughly about 70 to 80% of all of the businesses comprised of the tourism industry are small businesses. From that, I mean they employ approximately 20 people or less. This segment is really the backbone of the tourism industry. And

this past year, and as we look down the road to a future, this is a segment that is going to be dramatically and harshly impacted by the continuously rising utility rates, whether it be through their actual usage, but probably more so in the area of demand charge. If you are unaware of utility rates, we are charged •• businesses are charged on the basis of two rates; one is your actual usage, which you can to a great extent control; and the other is on•demand charges, which is basically identified during the period between June and September. It's the peak •• it is driven from the peak usage during that time frame and is then charged for the balance of the year.

Here on Long Island, here in Suffolk County, as you are well aware, a good portion of our visitors •• visitor businesses close down for the winter, yet they are still being charged utility rates throughout the year and throughout the time that they're closed on the basis of what was peak period back during the summer months. We have seen a number of small businesses, and we expect this to grow considerably, having to consider whether or not to stay open, continue to employ as many people as they might to put other bills off until they can take care of the utility charge and what have you, therefore, to make some critical decisions to their actual survivability.

We have approached the Travel Industry Coalition of New York State, and we have been asked and they have accepted to put this as one of their top three initiatives that they take before the State Legislature on annual basis, asking for the State's Public Services Committee to look into this as it relates to small businesses. I might also add, businesses are charged demand charges on the basis of a large•size or small•size business. And this organization which is comprised of associations representing the very diverse segments of the tourism industry, from golf course owners to lodging, to restaurants, to campground associations and what have you. They have all come together in a collective voice in support of the Public Service Commission looking into some relief for small businesses of these excessive demand charges.

We have also here on Long Island approached a very receptive State Legislative body, not a body, but a group of Legislators ranging from Legislator Fields to Fitzpatrick and Allesi and a number of others. And they likewise are working with us to carry that voice forward. So this is more informational for you as members of the Economic Development Committee of Suffolk County. But I think it is something that ultimately does need to be addressed, because they comprise, as I say, not only the backbone of our industry, but really the backbone of the products that we market, promote and sell here on Long Island. With that, I would be more than happy to touch any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. McGowan. We appreciate your comments, and I know we have a lot of questions for you. One, I just wanted to comment on the wi•fi wi•max progress. I Co•Chair that commission, and we have recently put together a committee of 15 people. And it's more brains than I certainly have are on that committee. And I think that it's moving forward in a progress manner, very thoughtful. I think it's going to happen. So I'm very appreciative of that. And Sharon Cates•Williams is the mover and shaker behind my wings. I think that's •• I'm glad to see that your industry feels that it is going to be important, as I do for, Long Island, but particularly for the tourism business. Just a quick question on gas prices. How do you think that's going to affect this year's tourism.

MR. MCGOWAN:

It is going to have an effect on tourism overall. How it will impact us is one of those questions. What we do know is that historically, leading up to this year, really since post 9/11, Americans will continue to travel. The question is how long they will travel, how far they will travel and what impact have on their discretionary expenditures and what have you.

We have consolidated our advertising marketing within a 250 mile drive radius. We are not trying to go beyond that. And essentially, if you will, that is a tank of gas here and a tank of gas to get home and probably a tank of gas to get around and enjoy what we have to offer. Basically we know that Americans will travel three to five times during the year. Now, that's up until post-Katrina. We expect that they will probably travel two to four times a year. The duration of that travel, whether they fly or drive, will be one of consideration.

I honestly don't believe we're going to be dramatically impacted at all. Availability is the real question, availability of gasoline. It's one thing to travel to a destination, it's another thing and a consideration to be able to get home from that travel. If there is any kind of impact on the availability to where it might be long gas lines at the gas station only to find out that it might not be available, that will have a dramatic impact. We don't foresee that though.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you. The other •• one more before I turn this over. Your comment on the utility rates. And I understand demand. I used to be involved with the Jones Beach Theater, which it used to drive me crazy, they charged me the rates of the state with the rates of the cost of running the Jones Beach Theater in the middle of summer as in the middle of the winter when there was no activity, and I just didn't understand it as a process. What are you recommending? Is that a suggestion or what?

MR. MCGOWAN:

First off, we do want to have it looked at from a fair and equitable standpoint, that is that small businesses where there is seasonality, where there is regionality that those things be taken into consideration and that not everything be •• rates be charged on a straight flat basis as you would charge a business that's open year round and what have you.

We would like it studied. We would like it looked into. And we would also like the accountability of the authorities, the various authorities, whether here on Long Island, obviously LIPA, to be accountable for what they are charging on•demand to small businesses versus what they're charging to large businesses and are they giving the small businesses the same opportunities to mitigate their demand charges as they are to large. There are ways for large businesses to utilize equipment and technology to mitigate those demand spikes during the time frames that they are assessed. It's very costly, excessively costly, for a small business to incorporate.

Second to that is we have to understand that small businesses for •• to a great extent are comprised of folks who are actively engaged in that business themselves and they do not have the staff to look into and deal with or work with the mitigation of their demand charges. They typically will receive that utility bill, they typically will sigh, moan and pay the bill without looking beyond that, because they are •• for the most part, two•thirds of their day they're actively engaged in the business itself. So there's a number of things that if we can get the Public Services Commission to address the issues, put will actually put forth an agenda that we would like them to focus on.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Have you spoken to any of your State Legislators on this issue?

MR. MCGOWAN:

Yes, in fact, throughout Long Island, both in Nassau County as well as here in Suffolk County. Legislator Ginny Fields has been very proactive and involved in it, and she has brought a number of other Legislators, both from the west end as well as the east end, Marc Allesi, Mike Fitzpatrick, Chuck Lavine from Nassau County, etcetera. We have actually had two or three meetings between ourselves and a group of these Legislators. And they are, if you will, trying to strategize, if you will, on the best way to take this issue forward.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Its the argument that if the businesses are paying less than, then that would reflect back onto the residents and they'll have to raise residential rates?

MR. MCGOWAN:

Well, you know, I think that there's always going to be •• as I've heard, somebody is going to pay, and I think that's definitely one of them.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Chairman Kessel says it often.

MR. MCGOWAN:

He says it often and loud. And, you know, I think the question is one of the accountability issues is that we understand demand charges and the reason for them, and we support them. It's been around since the turn the century

when our power grids first set up. And these dollars are supposed to go capital expenditures and improvements. We would like to make sure that the utilities, authorities, are held accountable for that and that those dollars are not going into operational needs and other uses.

You know, we do question, if you will, do we have to have such large charges for, you know, the things that we look at, from salaries to public relations agencies, etcetera, you know, and are those dollars well spent. I might add and I think I have to honestly add a lot of the same questions that fell on the Convention and Visitors Bureau, we're now raising, if you will, as it relates to utility charges and accountability and what have you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I think it's an interesting topic to discuss further. Moke, maybe we can sit down and join Ginny Fields and others to see where the possibilities of addressing the demand issues •• it is truly I know what that could be like particularly for a seasonal business closed up for the winter paying those same types of dollars that they would be paying during the summer months. It's not fair.

MR. MCGOWAN:

You'll find that such organizations as the Campgrounds Association and certainly Ski Resort Association have worked on behalf of their members to bring about some mitigation of the demand charges being very seasonal. But it is a state•wide issue dealing with other authorities throughout the state. So that's why we did try to approach it from a state•wide perspective.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you. Keep me in the loop on that.

MR. MCGOWAN:

I'd be more than happy to.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Ms. Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

Good morning, Moke, how are you. One of the questions I wanted to ask you was about the gas prices, but let me just jump to what I wanted to tell you also or mention, we have worked together, Moke and I, over the years in Economic Development, and we went through some times where •• up and down times because Mr. McGowan was here new and taking over, but I just want to take a minute to congratulate you on bringing back the professionalism and the dignity and the reputation. You have done a wonderful job, and you do it with so much interest. You care and it shows. And you are all over the place. I think we all appreciate it in Suffolk County especially.

MR. MCGOWAN:

Thank you.

LEG. NOWICK:

What I was going to ask you was about gas prices, but now that I'm thinking about the gas prices, that may, as I see it, keep some of the Suffolk County residents in Suffolk County rather than in the middle of the summer traveling to maybe Massachusetts or to another county to spend their money. I think that people plan for vacations at least once a year, maybe more. And so maybe they will turn around and say, hey, you know what? Suffolk County has beautiful golf courses, beaches, places to go. And maybe that will work in our favor hopefully.

MR. MCGOWAN:

I think it will. The interesting thing is, and I can't speak to Suffolk County residents, but I think we have seen over the years that Suffolk County, especially the East End, has been a vacation destination for the folks from Queens and Brooklyn. And I think that this will have impact on their decisions. We know that people are going to stay close to home. And that to recharge their batteries they may take the extended three, four, five day weekend. And whether or not they travel and get out about on the Island or go off the island is certainly the question. We would fully expect that one of their battery recharge times frames, they will stay on the island. It might even be two or three times. But they will ultimately go off the Island. We are a destination for New York City, we are a destination for New Jersey, we are a destination for the folks in the boroughs on the west end of the Island. So I think all of those things bode very nicely and very well for us.

LEG. NOWICK:

I think it may be that, and I think also •• maybe pushing also local businesses to •• I know that local businesses sometimes like to take clients to different places, and hopefully they'll be bringing these clients to the vineyards or to the golf courses on the East End rather than any place else. So maybe it will work out. Thank you.

MR. MCGOWAN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Any further questions? All right. Mr. McGowan, thank you very much. I do appreciate you coming down. Before you leave, one quick question. The finances, how are we doing as far as the Convention?

MR. MCGOWAN:

Let me address that by saying two things. One, is our financial house is incredibly in order. Now having said that, we do have •• we have had continuing difficulties and challenges with our friends in Nassau County that has not been a reflection on the Convention and Visitors Bureau, but more unfortunately the politics of the county itself. It delayed, if you will, a Home Rule Message going forward in a timely fashion allowing the continuation of the hotel tax collections into 2006.

My understanding, however, is that the State Legislature is voting on that ••

I believe it's on their calendar today. It will be retroactive to January 1 or the point of time in which hotels actually again started collecting and holding the taxes. That's merely, if you will, an impact on our cash flow. We may take a short-term loan for a period of 30 days as a bridge between when we start receiving those dollars and our needs to meet payroll and rent and things of that nature. If there had been no interruption whatsoever, we would have been in an extremely health situation. We did face a challenge of a debt of over \$500,000 a year and a half ago. That has been mitigated down to only what we owe our vendors on a 30 day cycle right now. So we are very strong on financial footing.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you. That's good news. Any further questions? Thanks very much. Be a friend to this committee, you know, let us know what's going on. Anything you feel that we should be addressing, pushing forward for the Long Island economy, we're here for you.

MR. MCGOWAN:

Thank you. There are obviously some new faces on the committee. I look forward to building those relationships. And it is a two-way communication, any time you may have a question about the activities of the bureau or things of that nature, Legislatively we are required to come before the Legislature twice a year through the Offices of Economic Development and Housing Commissioner Jim Morgo and report on the activities, and we look forward to that.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Great. Thank you. There are no cards. Okay. So we will move to the

agenda. Mr. Morgo, you want to come on up. In our discussion, we just quickly talked about 1072, which is not on the agenda. Why don't you explain what it is?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

1072, if you remember, was Legislator Schneiderman's legislation to impose ••

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

You're not on.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I'm always on. Good morning. Good morning, everyone. I have Francis S. Gabreski Airport Manager, Anthony Ceglie with me too for this resolution, IR 1072, and a couple of others that are going to be considered. You'll recall that Legislator Schneiderman proposed imposing extra surcharges for landings ••

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Two thousand dollars.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

And across the board. You all received a letter from the FAA saying that was

prearbitrary and there was no basis for it. In the mean times, Anthony has researched late night surcharges in other airports, found what the FAA has not rejected. I say it that way intentionally, it's not that they accepted it, they just haven't rejected it. And he found that a 33% late night surcharge based on weight and class as you have in the amended resolution that Legislator Schneiderman proposed has been tolerated rated by the FAA. What I think would be •• what would have to be done, because the legislation was tabled subject to call, you would need a motion to recall it for consideration. So I don't know if you want to do that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Any comments from my colleagues.

LEG. MONTANO:

In reference to?

MR. NOLAN:

1072.

LEG. MONTANO:

I missed that. What is it? You want us to call it.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I think that would probably be a good idea.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Is everybody on board with that?

LEG. COOPER:

So, jim, you're now in support of the resolution?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Yes. As it has been amended, Legislator Cooper.

LEG. COOPER:

I would make that motion.

LEG. MONTANO:

I have a question.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Jim, I'm reading the resolution and I'm looking at the second whereas clause. Now, this resolution was introduced by Schneiderman in January, what's the point of the second whereas clause, introduced •• the resolution was introduced by Legislator Schneiderman with the support of County Executive Steve Levy. We know it was introduced by Schneiderman, it doesn't have anything to do with the substance of the resolution. Why would that particular section be in a whereas clause?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It's in there because through the Executive Branch, namely, through the Airport Manager, the new and improved ••

LEG. MONTANO:

Jim, I don't really need an answer. That's a rhetorical question. What I'm implying is ••

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We're getting into the rhetoricals.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Can I give you a rhetorical answer?

LEG. MONTANO:

Sure.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

You know why it's in there.

LEG. MONTANO:

And the reason I asked the question is that we went through this last year. I really think that the resolutions should speak for themselves and the whereas clause should pertain to the reasons why and the substance of the subject matter coming before us. I know it's a very •• you know, to some it may seem very petty or minor point, but it is a procedural aspect, which just draws my attention to it, and really unnecessarily.

Now with respect to the substantial of the bill, I do recall that we had someone from FAA come in on maybe a different bill where they said that the County didn't have the authority to set some kind of landing fees. Is this the same •• are we on the same subject matter?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Seriously, let me answer two of your questions, a rhetorical one and the

substantive one, because they are connected. What was done through the Administrative Branch was at a find a mechanism where the County could impose a late night surcharge, and that's what, as I started to say, that Tony worked on with Legislator Schneiderman and with the County Executive's Office, of course. And this 33% surcharge, and I should probably have Tony explain this, because he'll do it better than I, but it's based on the different class of aircraft and the different weight of aircraft. The original resolution was \$2000 across the board based on nothing except to do something to curtail the late night landings. This one is based on specific criteria. And probably more important, it already exists in other local airports.

LEG. MONTANO:

So we are not treading in uncharted areas so to speak in terms of setting a fee. FAA is not going to say, you don't have the right to set a fee, they're going to look at the reasonableness of the fee and say this fee is set for a legitimate •• legitimate purpose and it's not set to arbitrarily, you know, cater to or adhere to some civic association that comes before as they did here you saying we don't want any aircraft landing, therefore, we're going to impose a \$2000 or \$5000 fee, which makes it prohibitive, is that what you are saying?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Yeah. You used the key word, it's not arbitrary. Tony, you want to add to that?

MR. CEGLIO:

Yeah. If I could just jump in. You made a good point in saying it's not arbitrary, it's also not made to be restrictive. What the FAA says is it should be imposed to re•coop costs •• additional costs that may be incurred for

aircraft landing after a certain time. Currently, we have what's called pilot control lighting, our airfield lights go off after eleven o'clock. If air crafts land after 11:00, they have to activate these lights. The additional fee, 33%, will be used to re•coop those fees to keep the lights on for 15 minutes, the wear and tear on the equipment, the administrative cost to handle the noise complaints that are associated with that. And we feel that we should be able to justify that 33%. And it is something, like I said, we did some research at other airports in the area, there is one that currently charges 33%, the other two are looking to increase their fees at night, they just haven't gone through the process.

LEG. MONTANO:

That was going to be my next question. In terms of other airports, other jurisdictions with similar, if you can find them, similar demographics, etcetera, etcetera, what is their policy with respect to, you know, air craft landing fees and the like. That's essentially what you answered. You said that this is not out of the norm.

MR. CEGLIO:

No, it's not out of the norm, and it's not considered unreasonable. Checking with the FAA, their concern is the reasonableness of the fees, and that if they got any complaints about it, they'd have to investigate and we'd have to justify it. Thirty three percent, for instance, to a small aircraft, single engine landing during the day at Gabreski is \$5, noncommercial. It will bring that fee up to \$6.86. Again, not unreasonable. Where the larger fees come in are the corporate aircraft that might come in after 11:00. The ones that are paying say \$200 now might go up to \$266 after eleven o'clock. Again, for a corporate operator, not unreasonable.

LEG. MONTANO:

And you have no idea •• last question •• what the impact would be with respect to diverting landings to another area? You have no way of measuring that, right?

MR. CEGLIO:

(Shaking head no).

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Ms. Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

Good morning. I just had one question. I'm looking at legislation here. On the page two, film industry, are those new rates there for the film industry? Is that ••

MR. CEGLIO:

It's always been part of the legislation. The only change we have there are for the runways. It was \$100 per day, we're changing that to \$100 per hour, and the reason that it takes more administrative costs, and it also costs the County more to close the runway down than it would cost, for instance, for a taxi way per day.

LEG. NOWICK:

Now, does a plane that •• I'm not sure I know. When a plane lands, do they go on a taxiway then on a runway, or is that two separate things?

MR. CEGLIO:

Two separate things. They land on a runway then go on a taxiway.

LEG. NOWICK:

So a plane lands and maybe they'll use the runway or they'll use a taxiway or they use both?

MR. CEGLIO:

No. When a plane lands, it has to use both.

LEG. NOWICK:

I just know we land, we get off.

MR. CEGLIO:

It lands on a runway, then get off on the taxiway and go to wherever you're going to go.

LEG. NOWICK:

That's all I know. So in one day, they would incur fee of maybe 500, and of course, they use the terminal building and they have to use the ramp area, is that correct?

MR. CEGLIO:

An aircraft?

LEG. NOWICK:

For the film industry. I'm just curious. I Just wanted to know what it would cost for somebody to land a plane for the day, so you have to add the 500, the 250, all those figures?

MR. CEGLIO:

Well, for the film industry, what we're talking about is if the film industry wanted to use part of the airport, we would have to either close the taxiway down so they could use it so that aircraft wouldn't be going back and forth or close the runway down. Now, it costs us, like I said, to close a runway down,

because administrative costs, we'd have to have a guy out there escorting the film industry back and forth, the time it takes, I guess, to close that runway down, _NOTAMS_ have to be issued for the pilots. A taxiway is a little bit more simpler. We could cone it off. It's usually outside of an aircraft area. It's just easier to do for the taxiway, a ramp, part of the terminal building, that sort of thing.

LEG. NOWICK:

I'm not debating it, I was just curious. So I guess it would cost them somewhere about 1500 a day.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

On the larger picture beyond the airport through the whole Suffolk County economy, we are encouraging all filming on •• in Suffolk County, because it's quite an economic generator, as you know.

LEG. NOWICK:

Sure. I remember when we had •• in St. James when they filmed that house. What did they make there? What was the estimate?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It was incredible.

LEG. NOWICK:

Maybe Mitch Pally had mentioned it.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

The Extreme Makeover thing. I don't remember the exact figure, but it was more than I would have thought, like 6 million or something like that.

LEG. NOWICK:

Bring them back. I was just curious.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

They stayed at Danford's, they generated all kinds of stuff.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I have Mr. Barraga first.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Just one quick question, because I was listening intently in terms of Jim Morgo's explanation with reference to these rates and the FAA. I guess my question is this, I mean, obviously your airport manager has done a great deal of work comparing Gabreski with other airports in the area to come up with the appropriate rates. It would seem to me though that before you

asked this Legislature to do anything, you would sit with the FAA to see if they're willing to sign off on these rate increases. What is the point of us taking this up only to find out later that the FAA has rejected the rate increases?

MR. CEGLIO:

I have spoken to the FAA about it, told them what we are proposing, I told them what the other airports are charging and what some of the other airports are intending to charge. They are, I guess, indifferent about it. They can't •• they can't authorize us to charge a certain rate. They say that we have to charge something that's reasonable. Now, again, just going through the rates and adding the 33% knowing that another airport has done it already and reviewing that with the FAA, they consider that reasonable. They will review it and make a determination on it only if they get complaints from the users that it is unreasonable.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

A couple of other points too that I have to be quick to point out. I'm surprised that Legislator Montano didn't point this out. We are not asking for this, this is Legislator Schneiderman's resolution. And the fact, as Tony explained, this kind of rate has been in effect at other area airports, which I indicated at the beginning. The FAA hasn't given it its imprimatur, but has not opposed it either. So that's that situation.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Presiding Officer Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Not only that, I mean, the original resolution that Legislator Schneiderman proposed was really extreme.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Arbitrary, I think, was the word.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. The other comment I want to make is we've imposed all different kinds of rates at the airport in the past. And we, in the past, have not collected them. We are going to collect these, right?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

You answer that.

MR. CEGLIO:

I was going to say, yeah, we are collecting the rates. They are higher than they've ever •• well, at least the revenue is higher than it's ever been in the history of the airport. These late night fees are not going to generate very much additional revenue. From the information that I've been getting, we've only been tracking aircraft after eleven o'clock since November through the Sheriff's Department. We've only had nine aircraft land after eleven o'clock in the last say five or six months. So these aren't going to generate a lot of additional revenue, but what it will do, we're hoping, encourage the aircraft

to come in before eleven o'clock to pay the lesser fees.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But the other point is whether it generates a lot of revenue or it doesn't generate a lot of revenue is we're going to collect it.

MR. CEGLIO:

Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Mr. Presiding Officer, I would like the airport manager to talk about the increased revenues, because indeed the rents have been collected in the last couple of years. How have we done in the last couple of years, Tony?

MR. CEGLIO:

Well, before the rates were changed in 2004 •• actually 2003, I believe we collected \$1200 in landing fee revenues. The rates changed were in June of 2004, between June and January we collected about \$200,000. For all of 2005, we collected a little over 300,000. So we're doing a lot better with collections.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Thank you for the question.

P.O. LINDSAY:

The question is leading to the point that maybe some day our airport will pay for itself.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

We're trying to do that. We're hoping.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Legislator. With that being the case, Legislator Cooper, would you like to make a motion?

LEG. COOPER:

I'd like to make a motion to consider Resolution 1072 and bring it before us.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Seconded Legislator Barraga. Any question on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? So moved.

1072, amending resolution 673 • 2004, to impose a fee for late night landings at Francis S. Gabreski Airport.

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to approve, is there a second on the motion.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Seconded by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? So moved.

LEG. MONTANO:

Abstention.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

APPROVED (VOTE:4•1•0•0 • Abstention • Legis. Montano). Going back to **1143**, adopting a Charter Law to require all leases for property at Francis S. Gabreski Airport to be approved by the Legislature to streamline County government.

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to approve.

LEG. MONTANO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Cooper, seconded by Legislator Montano. Any question on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE:5•0•0•0)**

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

For the record, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to mention that at the last full meeting of the Legislature, I mentioned that there would be citizen oriented committee, community oriented committee established prior to this

committee meeting. You remember you said you would have tabled this if it were not done? It was done and it's •• •

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Boy, such power.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It provides more of a community forum than the Airport Lease Screening Committee ever did. I have copies of the Executive Office establishing it, if anybody would like to see that.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Again, Commission Morgo has just mentioned if you would like to see that letter from the establishment of •• Executive Order?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I have the Executive Order.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

You have the Executive Order itself. Okay. I'd be glad to provide that to you any time you request it. All righty. So, okay. **1163, establishing a task force to study the feasibility of increasing revenues and promoting economic development by establishing a horseracing track in Suffolk**

County. Is there a motion to approve 1163?

LEG. COOPER:

No. Motion to table, please.

LEG. NOWICK:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to table, seconded by Legislator Nowick. All in favor of tabling?
Opposed? It has been **Tabled (VOTE:5•0•0•0)**.

1413, establishing a commission to evaluate school district expenses and efficiency.

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Cooper, seconded Legislator Montano.

LEG. BARRAGA:

On the resolution.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

On the resolution, Legislature Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

This particular resolution really deals with trying to make an evaluation of the school district expenses and how they can operate on a more efficient basis. This certainly is nothing new. I think if you wanted a breakdown in terms of expenses, you could contact several state sources, including the State Education Departmental or even the local region. They can pretty much tell you how schools on average spend their money.

My figures may be a little skewed, but most of the time, anywhere between 70 and in some cases 83, 84% of a given budget is for personnel, for teachers, for administrators, for their pensions, for their health care. That's pretty much the way it runs from one school district to the next. I take a look at the makeup of this particular commission, and I find that quite a few of the individuals who would be appointed to the commission really, frankly, do not have any expertise in educational matters whatsoever.

I do find though that there are certain partners in education that are appointed; someone from the Nassau•Suffolk School Boards, someone from

the PTA, the Suffolk County region of the PTA, I also see, I believe, someone from the Superintendents Association. But what's interesting, the very group that represents the major percentage of money being expended on school districts, I don't see as part of the commission. The teachers, the New York State United Teachers. So what's going to happen with this commission, frankly, is that they'll all be in the room and they will blame the guy who's not in the room. That's what's going to happen with this.

If you're going to have the Commission at all, and you have to make the judgement as to whether or not this endeavor is worthwhile, at least put on the New York State United Teachers. I mean, this way you have their point of view, because once you get into a situation where you really can't discuss school consolidation and you can't discuss class size and you can't discuss quality of education, then you are going to lead yourself to those salaries for those teachers and administrators. So at least the group that's representing them should have a right to represent their point of view with the rest. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

I think that's a very good point and maybe the Majority Leader could reach out to the sponsor of the bill and suggest perhaps that we could do this and table for one cycle. Maybe we don't have to do that, maybe it could be amended.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

George can we have this bill amended it if it is his wish?

LEG. COOPER:

Actually, if we could, I'd like to pass over this. I want to try to reach the sponsor right now see and see if he would be amendable to making that change.

LEG. MONTANO:

He can't make it now.

LEG. COOPER:

I know. But this way we could approve it out of committee.

LEG. MONTANO:

We could approve it out of committee and he could amend it later.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

The only point I wanted to make in regard to Legislator Barraga's remarks is, you know, talking the sponsor about this particular legislation and I was also at a press conference that the County Executive had, and this is to kind of dovetail what the Executive announced, he's had ongoing talks with the Superintendents Association. And I think the focus is about not consolidating districts, which we've went through a million times, but maybe consolidating some administrative services at the top •• at the top end between districts maybe in certain areas. And they're talking about insurance and security. They weren't •• you know, at least on the Executive level, and I know the sponsor wants to go this way, it wasn't about making somebody the fall guy to blame, but a productive dialog about some consolidation that's makes sense.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I understand.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Let me finish for a minute, Tom. I certainly wouldn't have any objections to teachers on that panel. I think they should be on that panel.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Because I think what happens is that if they're not there, even though the intent is what you say, to look for administrative efficiencies, eventually if this commission is like others, they get to a point where they see that looming 80, 82% in personnel and they gravitate towards it. All I'm saying is that the major group that represents these people should be •• should be there.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And I don't object to that.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Is there a consensus of this group to pass it out of committee today?

LEG. MONTANO:

I'll make the motion.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Cooper will discuss Mr. D'Amaro about inviting the teachers into the committee itself.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Montano, seconded by Legislator Barraga. Are there any further comments? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE:5•0•0•0).**

1421, accepting and appropriating an amendment to the College Budget for a grant award from the State University of New York for

an Educational Opportunity Program 71% reimbursed by State funds at Suffolk County Community College.

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to approve Legislator Nowick, seconded Legislator Cooper. Any comments? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE:5 •0•0•0).**

1425, accepting and appropriating a grant award from the New York State Higher Education Services Corporation for a Higher Education Services Corporation Financial Aid Training Grant 100% reimbursed by state funds at Suffolk County Community College.

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to approve and put on the Consent Calender.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to approve and put on the Consent Calender, seconded by Legislator Montano. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED** and placed on the **CONSENT CALENDER (VOTE:5 •0•0•0).**

1431, accepting and appropriating a grant award from St. Charles Hospital, St. Catherine of Siena Medical Center and Central Suffolk Hospital for nursing facility 100% reimbursed by private funds at Suffolk County Community College.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Do I have a motion to approve and put on the Consent Calender? Legislator Montano, I'll second the motion. All in favor? Opposed? So moved.

APPROVED and placed on the **Consent Calender (VOTE:5•0•0•0).**

1434, appointing member to the Suffolk County Empire Development Zone Administrative Board, Vanessa Pugh.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Mr. Chairman, could I say something about this?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Sure. I want to invite Vanessa up too, if I may.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

The Suffolk County, Town of Riverhead Empire Zone is administered by a

Zone Administration Board. As you know, Wayne, there are 25 acres designated for Wyandanch in the Town of Babylon. We have not had a representative from Babylon, we've had Ann Marie Jones of the town filling in admirably and representing the interest of the town very well, but the town has now designated Vanessa Pugh. And we are eager to get her on the board.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

May I introduce Vanessa Pugh. By the way, Vanessa and I have gone back years. She is with Sustainable Long Island and she's been an advocate for the community for as long as I can remember. Vanessa.

MS. PUGH:

Good morning, Chairman Horsley, to the Vice•Chair and the Presiding Officer. My name is Vanessa Pugh, and I thank you for the opportunity to be before you this morning for my appointment to the Empire Zone Administration Board.

I'd just like to say very briefly, you did mention my work with Sustainable Long Island. I was the program director there for just about four and a half years. But the important thing is that I've been a community advocate and participant for well over 20 years in the Town of Babylon and am currently working also with the Town of Babylon on their economic revitalization projects on the Straight Path corridor.

Additionally, I also work for Nassau County in their Office of Economic Development. I believe that on behalf of the town and the community of

Wyandanch, I bring a unique perspective and understanding to economic development for the Town of Babylon and most specifically for Wyandanch. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you very much, Vanessa. And I am pleased that your name has been put forth, you are truly a credit to our community. Okay. Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

First of all, thank you very much for volunteering. We appreciate it in Suffolk County. But just •• which has nothing to do with you, maybe in the future when we do make appointments we could have some type of a resume or backup just so we know quickly when we look at it if we're not familiar with the designee at least we have an idea. Just for the future.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I think that's a great idea.

LEG. MONTANO:

That's generally done.

LEG. NOWICK:

I didn't see it.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Mr. Chairman, Vanessa has her resume with her.

LEG. NOWICK:

I know, Mr. Morgo, when you say something, I know you know what you're talking about. Just for the future.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

It make sense. Counsel Nolan has a Scribenor's error in the legislation. Would you like to explain that?

MR. NOLAN:

The resolution, Jim, says that she appointed to represent Wyandanch. I believe that should be Town of Babylon.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It should be.

MR. NOLAN:

So if the Clerk's Office •• that's a Scribenor's error and we should correct that to reflect that it's a Town of Babylon appointment.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

The 25 acres are in Wyandanch.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That covers it? Okay. I'd like to make the motion to approve 1434.

LEG. COOPER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Seconded by Legislator Montano. Any questions on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE:5•0•0•0)**. Thank you very much for volunteering. All righty.

1449, amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the emergency runway, taxiway and apron repairs at Francis S. Gabreski Airport.

LEG. MONTANO:

Explanation.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Tony to speak.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Tony to speak.

MR. CEGLIO:

I'm back. The resolution talks about emergency repairs at Gabreski Airport. Generally the runways and taxiways at Gabreski are in slight disrepair. They are constructed primarily of asphalt and concrete. The concrete, much of it was originally constructed in the early '40s. There are some asphalt areas also that were overlaid in previous years. However, the entire pavement area, runways and taxiways and ramp areas has not been sealed, crack sealed, in probably about 20 years.

Other the past two years, we've been using operating funds out of our Operating Budget to do certain portions. We've completed one of our runways. However, the remainder of the airport needs to be done to prevent further deterioration. We have applied for grant funding from the FAA for 1.2 million to rehab a portion of our main runway. However, that doesn't take into consideration all of the rest of the runways and taxiways. The money

that we are asking for here will primarily do the crack sealing on the all of the runways and taxiways, except for Runway 624 where we asked for FAA funding to make that repair.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

And the reason, Mr. Chairman, that it's an amended version, the original request was for half a million dollars, you remember, from Legislators Caracappa and Schneiderman. Tony did an analysis, and what's really needed is not everything they called for in that adjusted Capital Program, but only the cracks sealing, only to repair those cracks, which was a question of safety. So that's why it was reduced 350,000.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

My familiarity with crack sealing, isn't that usually done before paving?

MR. CEGLIO:

Yes. It can be done prior to paving, but it's also a preventive maintenance so that the frost and rain doesn't get in there and heave the asphalt or the concrete out.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Excuse me. I don't have the bill in front of me. What's the offset?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It's a new Capital Program.

MR. NOLAN:

The offset is infrastructure improvements for traffic and public safety, Capital Project 1755.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And is Budget Review okay with that?

MR. MUNCEY:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

He said yes.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

So it's not coming out of the Legislative appropriation?

MR. ZWIRN:

That's a good idea.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Just checking. All right. I'm learning. Okay. Is there a motion before us to approve Legislation 1449?

LEG. NOWICK:

Motion.

LEG. COOPER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Nowick, seconded by Legislator Cooper. Any further questions? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE:5 •0•0•0).**

1485, Authorizing the extension of sub•lease for hangar space located at Francis S. Gabreski Airport, Westhampton Beach, NY, for use by the Police Department Aviation Division.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Mr. Zwirn.

MR. ZWIRN:

This is a month to month lease with the landlord there. We have had some disputes with the landlord out at Gabreski Airport. This is where we have the police helicopters. And this is just to go to a month to month lease. It will give the County more leverage and the County Executive's Office is recommending •• the County Attorney's Office is recommending that we go ahead with this. We'll get the problems with the landlord resolved as we move forward with a new hangar out there for the police helicopters. It's just a stop•gap measure.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Any further comments? Legislator Cooper makes a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Nowick. Further discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE:5•0•0•0)**

1486, Accepting and appropriating an amendment to the college budget for a grant award from the US Department of Education for a Federal Work•Study Program 100% reimbursed by federal funds at Suffolk County Community College.

LEG. NOWICK:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Nowick and to place on the Consent Calender, seconded by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED** and placed on the **Consent Calender (VOTE:5•0•0•0)**.

1497, approving the lease of additional square footage of premises located at 30 Greene Avenue, Sayville, by Suffolk County Community College.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Montano, seconded by Legislator Nowick. All in favor? Opposed?

MR. ZWIRN:

Excuse me.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Just in time.

MR. ZWIRN:

My fault. The County Executive would ask that if that could be tabled just one cycle, because it's in the proposed budget and hasn't been approved yet. That's my understanding.

P.O. LINDSAY:

May I, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Please, yeah.

P.O. LINDSAY:

In what proposed budget, Ben, in the college budget?

MR. ZWIRN:

Community College budget, the '07 budget.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Would you come forward, George, too, because this is the nursing facility that's in my district where we're leasing space from the school district. The program is so successful that we have a couple hospitals that have bought into it. We need additional space in the building. I don't •• I don't ••

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

All right. Let me see if I •• I know you're passionate about this, but let me see if I can bring it back to the Chair. Mr. Zwirn, do you have any further comment on it at this point?

MR. ZWIRN:

No. It's not that we're proposing it, we're just asking that it be delayed for a cycle so we can •• maybe George can enlighten us a little bit.

MR. GATTA:

I share the Presiding Officer's passion for this project. Actually, Resolution 1431, which you just approved is a partnership with three hospitals. It's a six year partnership. It generates \$1.7 million to the college over those six years. That is in addition to four other hospitals. The initial one with Good Sam Hospital, that was 1.7 million over six years, and then a partnership with Mather Memorial Hospital, Brookhaven Hospital and Eastern Long Island Hospital. So we have a total of seven hospitals that have signed on with the College over the past year generating in excess of 4.4 million, and that's adjusted for collective bargaining agreements. So it will be higher than 4.4 million.

We have currently this year 90 additional nursing students, next year it will double to 180 additional nursing students in our RN Program. We're also in discussions with another major hospital in the County, we met last week, it looks very positive. And it may go beyond that to include just about every hospital in the County with the exception of Stony Brook. The point that Ben made regarding this being in the proposed budget for next year, that is correct. There is approximately \$15,000 in next year's requested budget for this additional space.

It is an efficiency move. What this additional room would be •• actually, it's two rooms that we will combine into one larger lecture space. It will allow to provide our nursing students that are currently in labs in that building in numbers of 20 students per lab, we can take two of those lab sections and combine them into the lecture component of the lab for anatomy and physiology and other nursing related lab courses and teach the lab •• excuse me •• give the lecture portion in the larger room for 40 students, enabling us to reduce the number of faculty, full•time faculty and adjuncts that need for the program.

Actually, this will generate savings to the College in the long run. But irrespective of that, the additional revenue that's being generated through these grants with the seven hospitals, 4.4 million is a significant amount of revenue and the \$15,000 that's in next year's budget seems like a small amount of money considering we will be generating additional revenue and even saving money through combining classes to make the operation even more efficient.

So we need this room finished by August 15th. The school district would be doing some minor renovations. I believe there's about a \$4000 price tag. If it were adopted by the end of the June that would be fine with us. However, recognizing that the Operating Budget will not be adopted by the Legislature

until some time in August and then pending Executive vetoes, we could be at August 25th. And if this funding were not including and this were not adopted •• so I think the argument that the Executive is making has some merit, but played out to its end, we could be in a position where we would not have this space for some strange reasons. I would recommend it be adopted now. I don't think it's a major issue.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Mr. Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Ben, maybe you could clarify your position, because the original lease here was adopted midstream between College budgets. We did it then. I don't understand what the reluctance is. I mean, I don't have an objection if you want to table it for one cycle. But it's such a good program, you know, I would hate to see it, because of a technicality, be stonewalled somewhere.

MR. ZWIRN:

Let me state the position. If it's approved and gets to the floor, if there's a problem, it can always be stalled on the floor the Ledge. But the concern was that because the budget had not been adopted officially, that the money is not in there for the •• the money has not been adopted for the lease payments on this. So it would be putting the ••

P.O. LINDSAY:

By my point is the original lease wasn't in the College Operating Budget, it was adopted in between budgets. And, you know, the College found the money to pay for it because of the additional revenue that came in as a result of increasing this program in terms of students.

MR. ZWIRN:

I'm not trying to stand in the way of the Legislature. I just wanted to •• I got on the record what the County Executive's concerns were. It's not aimed at the program in particular. It's just at the way •• the procedure.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Any further questions from the Legislature? Okay. I think we will follow the passion of our Presiding Officer and make a motion by Legislator Montano to approve, seconded by Legislator Nowick. All in favor? Opposed? So moved.

APPROVED (VOTE:5•0•0•0)

LEG. MONTANO:

Renee, put me as a cosponsor. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Moving along to the **Memorializing Resolution 25, in support of tougher penalties for hazing and bullying.**

Is there anybody who would like to speak? I understood that there was.

Apparently not. Any questions from the Legislature? Okay. May have a motion to anything •• approve?

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Cooper, seconded by •• I'll second the motion. Geez, you guys are of tough at the end. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE:5•0•0•0).**

That concludes the meeting. If there's no other further business in front of us today, have a good day.

(* THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:57 A.M.*)

_ _ **DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY**